REMARKS

This Response supplements the amendments and remarks from Amendment F, filed October 5, 2004. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner give full consideration to this supplemental Response, together with Amendment F, and pursuant to the Request for Continued Examination, which was also filed on October 5, 2004.

Applicants further traverse the rejection of claims 1-16 under Section 103 based on the combination of Nakamura, Hayama, and Kudo because none of these three prior art references, alone or together, teach or suggest the auxiliary electrode structure of the present invention, as featured in amended claims 1 and 8.

As previously argued, Nakamura specifically teaches away from the present invention by requiring a different type of display device than the twisted nematic type of the present invention. This difference between the two types of devices is not insignificant. The present invention is directed to address a problem of disclination change in the liquid crystal caused by the flow of liquid crystal molecules. The disclination change problem can occur in twisted nematic devices, such as that recited by the present invention, but not in the different type of non-nematic device required by Nakamura. Moreover, even in twisted nematic devices, the problem solved by the present invention should only be known to occur when particular shapes of electrodes, such as the H-shaped electrode of the present invention, are utilized in a twisted nematic device. Nakamura also fails to teach such an electrode structure.

Therefore, in order to help expedite prosecution, Applicants have further amended independent claims 1 and 8 to clarify the structure of the auxiliary electrode of the present invention. Specifically, claims 1 and 8 now more clearly recite that the auxiliary electrode has an H-shaped form. None of the three cited references, alone or together, teach or suggest any such shape to the auxiliary electrode.

In fact, both Nakamura and Kudo fail to teach or suggest *any* specific form for an auxiliary electrode. Only Hayama of the three references even shows a form to any of its electrodes. Hayama though, clearly shows in all of its disclosed figures only linear forms for its electrodes, and no H-shaped forms. More specifically, Hayama merely discloses a circuit for driving a liquid crystal panel with reduced power consumption. Although Hayama does describe an auxiliary capacitance, Hayama provides no teaching or suggestion for the structural form of such an auxiliary capacitance. And even more particularly, Hayama fails to teach or suggest any structural form for an auxiliary capacitance that will cause the problem of disclination change in a twisted nematic liquid crystal device, a problem which is specifically addressed and solved by the present invention.

Nakamura is lacking similarly to Hayama (in addition to the fact that it specifically teaches away from the present invention). Nakamura is silent about a structure for an auxiliary capacitance, problems of disclination change, and twisted nematic devices in general. And because Kudo also remains silent about the structural form of an auxiliary capacitance, and particularly the use of such a structured form in combination with a twisted

nematic device, the rejection of independent claims 1 and 8 of the present invention (and their respective dependent claims 2-7 and 9-16) based on the Examiner's proposed combination of references is further respectfully traversed.

For at least these additional reasons therefore, Applicants submit that this Application, including claims 1-17, is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney if an interview would further expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By

Josh C. Snider
Registration No. 47,954

Customer No. 24978

November 22, 2004

300 South Wacker Drive
Suite 2500
Chicago, IL 60606
Tel: (312) 360-0080
Fax: (312) 360-9315
P:\DOCS\0941\63502\755598.DOC